



# County of San Diego

**MARK WARDLAW**  
DIRECTOR  
PHONE (858) 694-2962  
FAX (858) 694-2555

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT SERVICES  
5510 OVERLAND AVENUE, SUITE 310, SAN DIEGO, CA 92123  
[www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds)

## **Statement of Reasons for Exemption from Additional Environmental Review and 15183 Checklist Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines §15183**

**Date:** March 16, 2017  
**Project Title:** Germann Tentative Map  
**Record ID:** PDS2006-3100-5520 (TM), LOG NO. PDS2006-3910-06-14-048 (ER)  
**Plan Area:** Lakeside Plan Area  
**GP Designation:** Village Residential (VR-4.3)  
**Density:** 4.3 units per gross acre  
**Zoning:** Single Family Residential (RS)  
**Min. Lot Size:** 10,000 square feet  
**Special Area Reg.:** Airport Review (C)  
**Lot Size:** 5.2 acres  
**Applicant:** Don Mitchell, Engineer (619)244-8481  
**Staff Contact:** Marisa Smith - (858) 694-2621  
[marisa.smith@sdcounty.ca.gov](mailto:marisa.smith@sdcounty.ca.gov)

### **Project Description**

The project is a major subdivision to divide a 5.2-acre property into either 13 residential lots or 14 residential lots, depending on the drainage option. The project would be conditioned to allow for either scenario. The project site is located at 9212 Westhill Road in the Lakeside Community Plan Area. Access to each lot would be provided by individual driveways connecting to a proposed private road easement, which would connect to Westhill Road, a public road. Water would be provided by Padre Dam and Sewer would be provided by Lakeside Sanitation District. Earthwork will consist of 14,600 cubic yards of balanced cut and fill.

The project site is subject to the Village Residential General Plan Regional Category, Land Use Designation Village. Zoning for the site is Signal Family Residential (RS). The project is consistent with density and lot size requirements of the General Plan and Zoning Ordinance.

### **Overview**

California Public Resources Code section 21083.3 and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15183 provide an exemption from additional environmental review for projects that are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) was certified, except as might be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the

project or its site. Section 15183 specifies that examination of environmental effects shall be limited to those effects that: (1) Are peculiar to the project or the parcel on which the project would be located, and were not analyzed as significant effects in a prior EIR on the zoning action, general plan, or community plan, with which the project is consistent, (2) Are potentially significant off-site impacts and cumulative impacts which were not discussed in the prior EIR prepared for the general plan, community plan or zoning action, or (3) Are previously identified significant effects which, as a result of substantial new information which was not known at the time the EIR was certified, are determined to have a more severe adverse impact than discussed in the prior EIR. Section 15183(c) further specifies that if an impact is not peculiar to the parcel or to the proposed project, has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then an additional EIR need not be prepared for that project solely on the basis of that impact.

### **General Plan Update Program EIR**

The County of San Diego General Plan Update (GPU) establishes a blueprint for future land development in the unincorporated County that meets community desires and balances the environmental protection goals with the need for housing, agriculture, infrastructure, and economic vitality. The GPU applies to all of the unincorporated portions of San Diego County and directs population growth and plans for infrastructure needs, development, and resource protection. The GPU included adoption of new General Plan elements, which set the goals and policies that guide future development. It also included a corresponding land use map, a County Road Network map, updates to Community and Subregional Plans, an Implementation Plan, and other implementing policies and ordinances. The GPU focuses population growth in the western areas of the County where infrastructure and services are available in order to reduce the potential for growth in the eastern areas. The objectives of this population distribution strategy are to: 1) facilitate efficient, orderly growth by containing development within areas potentially served by the San Diego County Water Authority (SDCWA) or other existing infrastructure; 2) protect natural resources through the reduction of population capacity in sensitive areas; and 3) retain or enhance the character of communities within the unincorporated County. The SDCWA service area covers approximately the western one third of the unincorporated County. The SDWCA boundary generally represents where water and wastewater infrastructure currently exist. This area is more developed than the eastern areas of the unincorporated County, and would accommodate more growth under the GPU.

The GPU EIR was certified in conjunction with adoption of the GPU on August 3, 2011. The GPU EIR comprehensively evaluated environmental impacts that would result from Plan implementation, including information related to existing site conditions, analyses of the types and magnitude of project-level and cumulative environmental impacts, and feasible mitigation measures that could reduce or avoid environmental impacts.

### **Summary of Findings**

The Germann Tentative Map (PDS2006-3100-5520) is consistent with the analysis performed for the GPU EIR. Further, the GPU EIR adequately anticipated and described the impacts of the proposed project, identified applicable mitigation measures necessary to reduce project specific impacts, and the project implements these mitigation measures. See [http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS\\_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR\\_7.00 Mitigation Measures\\_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_7.00_Mitigation_Measures_2011.pdf) for complete list of GPU Mitigation Measures.

A comprehensive environmental evaluation has been completed for the project as documented in the attached §15183 Exemption Checklist. This evaluation concludes that the project qualifies for an exemption from additional environmental review because it is consistent with the development density and use characteristics established by the County of San Diego General Plan, as analyzed by the San

Diego County General Plan Update Final Program EIR (GPU EIR, ER #02-ZA-001, SCH #2002111067), and all required findings can be made.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15183, the project qualifies for an exemption because the following findings can be made:

**1. The project is consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified.**

The project would subdivide a 5.2-acre property into either 13 residential lots or 14 residential lots, depending on the drainage option. This proposal is consistent with the Village Residential development density established by the General Plan and the certified GPU EIR.

**2. There are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site, and which the GPU EIR Failed to analyze as significant effects.**

The subject property is no different than other properties in the surrounding area, and there are no project specific effects which are peculiar to the project or its site. The project site is located in an area developed with similarly sized, estate residential lots with associated accessory uses. The property does not support any peculiar environmental features, and the project would not result in any peculiar effects.

In addition, as explained further in the 15183 Checklist below, all project impacts were adequately analyzed by the GPU EIR. The project could result in potentially significant impacts to Paleontology and water quality resources. However, applicable mitigation measures specified within the GPU EIR have been made conditions of approval for this project.

**3. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which the GPU EIR failed to evaluate.**

The proposed project is consistent with the density and use characteristics of the development considered by the GPU EIR and would represent a small part of the growth that was forecast for build-out of the General Plan. The GPU EIR considered the incremental impacts of the proposed project, and as explained further in the 15183 Exemption Checklist below, no potentially significant off-site or cumulative impacts have been identified which were not previously evaluated.

**4. There is no substantial new information which results in more severe impacts than anticipated by the GPU EIR.**

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, no new information has been identified which would result in a determination of a more severe impact than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

**5. The project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR.**

As explained in the 15183 exemption checklist below, the project will undertake feasible mitigation measures specified in the GPU EIR. These GPU EIR mitigation measures will be undertaken through project design, compliance with regulations and ordinances, or through the project's conditions of approval.

**March 16, 2017**

Signature

Date

**Marisa Smith**

Printed Name

**Project Manager**

Title

## **CEQA Guidelines §15183 Exemption Checklist**

### **Overview**

This checklist provides an analysis of potential environmental impacts resulting from the proposed project. Following the format of CEQA Guidelines Appendix G, environmental effects are evaluated to determine if the project would result in a potentially significant impact triggering additional review under Guidelines section 15183.

- Items checked “Significant Project Impact” indicates that the project could result in a significant effect which either requires mitigation to be reduced to a less than significant level or which has a significant, unmitigated impact.
- Items checked “Impact not identified by GPU EIR” indicates the project would result in a project specific significant impact (peculiar off-site or cumulative that was not identified in the GPU EIR.
- Items checked “Substantial New Information” indicates that there is new information which leads to a determination that a project impact is more severe than what had been anticipated by the GPU EIR.

A project does not qualify for a §15183 exemption if it is determined that it would result in: 1) a peculiar impact that was not identified as a significant impact under the GPU EIR; 2) a more severe impact due to new information; or 3) a potentially significant off-site impact or cumulative impact not discussed in the GPU EIR.

A summary of staff’s analysis of each potential environmental effect is provided below the checklist for each subject area. A list of references, significance guidelines, and technical studies used to support the analysis is attached in Appendix A. Appendix B contains a list of GPU EIR mitigation measures.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>1. AESTHETICS</b> – Would the Project:			
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

- 1(a) The project would be visible from public roads and trails; however, the site is not located within a viewshed of a scenic vista.
- 1(b) The property is not within the viewshed of a County or state scenic highway. The project site also does not support any significant scenic resources that would be lost or modified through development of the property.
- 1(c) The project would be consistent with existing community character. The project is located in an area characterized by residential uses. The addition of 13 or 14 new residential lots would not substantially degrade the visual quality of the site or its surroundings.
- 1(d) Residential lighting would be required to conform with the County's Light Pollution Code to prevent spillover onto adjacent properties and minimize impacts to dark skies.

**Conclusion**

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to aesthetics; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>2. Agriculture/Forestry Resources</b>			
– Would the Project:			
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, or other agricultural resources, to a non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land, timberland, or timberland zoned Timberland Production?

☐ ☐ ☐

d) Result in the loss of forest land, conversion of forest land to non-forest use, or involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐ ☐ ☐

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Important Farmland or other agricultural resources, to non-agricultural use?

☐ ☐ ☐

### Discussion

2(a) The project and surrounding properties do not support any Farmland of Local Importance, Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.

2(b) The project site is not located within or adjacent to a Williamson Act contract or agriculturally zoned land.

2(c) There are no timberland production zones on or near the property.

2(d) The project site is not located near any forest lands.

2(e) The project site is not located near any important farmlands or active agricultural production areas.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to agricultural resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

### 3. Air Quality – Would the Project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the San Diego Regional Air Quality Strategy (RAQS) or applicable portions of the State Implementation Plan (SIP)?

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

☐ ☐ ☐

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

☐ ☐ ☐

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which

☐ ☐ ☐

exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

☐
☐
☐

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

☐
☐
☐

### Discussion

3(a) The project proposes development that was anticipated and considered by SANDAG growth projections used in development of the RAQS and SIP. As such, the project would not conflict with either the RAQS or the SIP. In addition, the operational emissions from the project are below screening levels, and will not violate any ambient air quality standards.

3(b) Grading operations associated with the construction of the project would be subject to the Grading Ordinance, which requires the implementation of dust control measures. Emissions from the construction phase would be minimal, temporary and localized, resulting in pollutant emissions below the screening level criteria established by County air quality guidelines for determining significance. In addition, the vehicle trips generated from the project will result in 140 Average Daily Trips (ADTs). According to the Bay Area Air Quality Management District CEQA Guidelines for Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans, projects that generate less than 2,000 ADT are below the screening-level criteria established by the guidelines for criteria pollutants.

3(c) The project would contribute PM10, NOx, and VOCs emissions from construction/grading activities; however, the incremental increase would not exceed established screening thresholds (see question 3(b) above).

3(d) The project will introduce additional residential homes which are considered new sensitive receptors; however, the project site is not located within a quarter-mile of any identified point source of significant emissions. Similarly, the project does not propose uses or activities that would result in exposure of these sensitive receptors to significant pollutant concentrations and will not place sensitive receptors near any carbon monoxide hotspots.

3(e) The project could produce objectionable odors during construction and operation; however, these substances, if present at all, would only be in trace amounts (less than 1 µg/m<sup>3</sup>).

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to air quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>4. Biological Resources – Would the Project:</b>			
Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Conflict with the provisions of any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional or state habitat conservation plan or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

#### Discussion

- 4(a) Based on an analysis of the County's Geographic Information System (GIS) records, aerial imagery of the site, and site photos, it has been determined that no native vegetation communities or habitats exist on or adjacent to the site. The site has been historically cleared in accordance with Section 86.503(a)(7) of the Biological Mitigation Ordinance (BMO) which permits clearing of up to 10 acres on parcels containing a home prior to October 22, 1997. Based on these considerations, no direct and indirect impacts to sensitive natural communities supporting candidate, sensitive, or special status species would occur.
- 4(b) Based on an analysis of the County's GIS records, aerial imagery of the site, and site photos, it has been determined that the proposed project site does not contain any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities as defined by the County of San Diego Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), County of San Diego Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), Natural Community Conservation Plan (NCCP), Fish and Wildlife Code, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act, or any other local or regional



plans, policies or regulations. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community.

- 4(c) The proposed project site does not contain any wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, stream, lake, river or water of the U.S., that could potentially be impacted through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, diversion or obstruction by the proposed development. Therefore, no impacts will occur to wetlands defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and under the jurisdiction of the Army Corps of Engineers.
- 4(d) Based on a GIS analysis, aerial imagery of the site, and site photos, it has been determined that the site is not part of a regional linkage/corridor as identified on MSCP maps nor is it in an area considered regionally important for wildlife dispersal. The site would not assist in local wildlife movement as it lacks connecting vegetation and visual continuity with other potential habitat areas in the general project vicinity. Adjoining properties surrounding the project site are already developed with residential uses.
- 4(e) Please refer to the attached Ordinance Compliance Checklist for further information on consistency with any adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Communities Conservation Plan, other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan, including Habitat Management Plans, Special Area Management Plans (SAMP), or any other local policies or ordinances that protect biological resources, including the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP), Biological Mitigation Ordinance, Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO), and Habitat Loss Permit (HLP).

### Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to biological resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>5. Cultural Resources – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to 15064.5?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

- |  |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature?                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?         | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### Discussion

5(a) Based on an analysis of records maintained by the County and the South Coastal Informational Center, it has been determined that there are no impacts to historical resources. Building records indicate that the existing single-family residence was constructed in 1949. However, the structure has been modified with several additions. A kitchen and flat was added approximately in 1960. The structure is a typical frame duplex structure on a concrete foundation. The structure will remain as part of the subdivision.

5(b) Based on an analysis of records maintained by the County and the South Coastal Informational Center, it has been determined that there are no impacts to archaeological resources because they do not occur within the project site. The project is infill development that is surrounded by small single-family residential lots. A residence is located in the southwestern portion of the parcel. The undeveloped portion of the property has been disturbed and graded historically as evidenced by the use of this portion of the property as a dirt bike track.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to cultural resources will be mitigated through compliance with the Grading Ordinance and through conformance with the County's Cultural Resource Guidelines if resources are encountered. Because the potential for the presence of subsurface deposits is very low, archaeological monitoring will not be required.

5(c) The site does not contain any unique geologic features that have been listed in the County's Guidelines for Determining Significance for Unique Geology Resources nor does the site support any known geologic characteristics that have the potential to support unique geologic features.

5(d) A review of the County's Paleontological Resources Maps and data on San Diego County's geologic formations indicates that the project is located on Upper Jurassic and Lower Cretaceous Marine and Non-Marine formations that have a marginal potential to contain unique paleontological resources.

As considered by the GPU EIR, potential impacts to paleontological resources will be mitigated through ordinance compliance and through implementation of the following mitigation measures: paleontological monitoring and conformance with the County's Paleontological Resource Guidelines and the Grading Ordinance. The GPU EIR identified these mitigation measures as Cul-3.1 and Cul-3.2.

5(e) Based on an analysis of records maintained by the County and the South Coastal Information Center, it has been determined that the project site does not include a formal cemetery or any archaeological resources that might contain interred human remains.

- 5(f) Based on an analysis of records, cultural surveys of the property, and Native American consultation, it has been determined that tribal cultural resources are not present within the project site.

Native American consultation included a Sacred Lands check which was initiated with the Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) on July 25, 2016. The Sacred Lands check conducted by the NAHC resulted in positive findings. The NAHC recommended that the Ewiiapaayp Band be contacted. The NAHC also provided a list of 13 tribes (Barona, Campo, Ewiiapaayp, Inaja, Jamul, Kwaaymii, La Posta, Manzanita, Mesa Grande, San Pasqual, Santa Ysabel, Sycuan, Viejas) who may have information related to the subject parcel. The 13 tribes including the Ewiiapaayp Band were contacted on October 5, 2016. To date, no tribal responses have been received.

### Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts to cultural resources; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR will be applied to the project.

### 6. Geology and Soils – Would the Project:

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, liquefaction, and/or landslides?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in an on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

☐☐☐

### Discussion

6(a)(i) The project is not located in a fault rupture hazard zone identified by the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act, Special Publication 42, Revised 1997, Fault-Rupture Hazards Zones in California, or located within any other area with substantial evidence of a known fault.

6(a)(ii) To ensure the structural integrity of all buildings and structures, the project must conform to the Seismic Requirements as outlined within the California Building Code. Compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.

6(a)(iii) The project site is not within a "Potential Liquefaction Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. In addition, the site is not underlain by poor artificial fill or located within a floodplain.

6(a)(iv) The site is located within a "Landslide Susceptibility Area" as identified in the County Guidelines for Determining Significance for Geologic Hazards. However, compliance with the California Building Code and the County Building Code will ensure that the project will not result in a significant impact.

6(b) According to the Soil Survey of San Diego County, the soils on-site are identified as Visalia sandy loam that has a soil erodibility rating of severe and Vista coarse sandy loam, that has a erodibility rating of moderate. However, the project will not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because the project will be required to comply with the Watershed Protection Ordinance (WPO) and Grading Ordinance which will ensure that the project would not result in any unprotected erodible soils, will not alter existing drainage patterns, and will not develop steep slopes. Additionally, the project will be required to implement Best Management Practices (BMPs) to prevent fugitive sediment.

6(c) The project is not located on or near geological formations that are unstable or would potentially become unstable as a result of the project.

6(d) The project is underlain by Visalia sandy loam and Vista coarse sandy loam, both of which are not considered to be an expansive soil as defined within Table 18-I-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994). Regardless, the project will not result in a significant impact because compliance with the Building Code and implementation of standard engineering techniques will ensure structural safety.

6(e) The project will rely on public water and sewer for the disposal of wastewater. No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from geology/soils; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>7. Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b> – Would the Project:			
a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 7(a) The project would produce GHG emissions through construction activities, vehicle trips, and residential fuel combustion. However, the project falls below the screening criteria that were developed to identify project types and sizes that would have less-than-cumulatively considerable GHG emissions. Screening thresholds have been published by the California Air Pollution Control Officers Association (CAPCOA) for determining the need for additional analysis and mitigation for GHG-related impacts under CEQA. The annual 900 metric ton carbon dioxide equivalent (MT CO<sub>2</sub>e) screening level referenced in the CAPCOA white paper (<http://www.capcoa.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2010/05/CAPCOA-White-Paper.pdf>) is being used by the County as a conservative criterion for determining the size of projects that would require further analysis and mitigation with regard to climate change. The CAPCOA white paper reports that the 900 metric ton screening level would capture more than 90% of development projects, allowing for mitigation towards achieving the State's GHG reduction goals. For example, a project including single family residential of 50 units or more or apartments and condominiums of 70 units or more would produce 900 metric tons. In addition, construction emissions would be temporary and the overall project emissions would fall below the screening criteria. For projects of this size, it is presumed that the construction and operational GHG emissions would not exceed 900 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e per year, and there would be a less-than cumulatively considerable impact.
- 7(b) As described above, the project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to global climate change. As such, the project would be consistent with County goals and policies included in the County General Plan that address greenhouse gas reductions. Therefore, the project would be consistent with emissions reduction targets of Assembly Bill 32, the Global Warming Solutions Act. Thus, the project would not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing emissions of greenhouse gas emissions.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to greenhouse gas emissions; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>8. Hazards and Hazardous Materials – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or wastes or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5, or is otherwise known to have been subject to a release of hazardous substances and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
h) Propose a use, or place residents adjacent to an existing or reasonably foreseeable use that would substantially increase current or future resident's exposure to vectors, including mosquitoes, rats or flies, which are capable of transmitting significant public health diseases or nuisances?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Discussion**

- 8(a) The project will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment because it does not propose the storage, use, transport, emission, or disposal of Hazardous Substances, nor are Hazardous Substances proposed or currently in use in the immediate vicinity. In addition, the project does not propose to demolish any existing structures onsite which could produce a hazard related to the release of asbestos, lead based paint or other hazardous materials.
- 8(b) The project is not located within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- 8(c) Based on a site visit and a comprehensive review of regulatory databases (see attached Hazards/Hazardous Materials references), the project site has not been subject to a release of hazardous substances. Additionally, the project does not propose structures for human occupancy or significant linear excavation within 1,000 feet of an open, abandoned, or closed landfill, is not located on or within 250 feet of the boundary of a parcel identified as containing burn ash (from the historic burning of trash), and is not on or within 1,000 feet of a Formerly Used Defense Site.
- 8(d) The proposed project is located within an Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP), an Airport Influence Area, or a Federal Aviation Administration Height Notification Surface. The project is a residential subdivision, and the lot is surrounded by existing residences. The proposed Tentative Map would be an allowed use for the area, as residential uses are compatible for the area. However, the project has been conditioned to add an aviation easement over the property, which would ensure that the land would not pose a hazard to any aircraft using Gillespie Field. This easement would also ensure that future property owners would be aware of the lands proximity to Gillespie Field.

In addition, the proposed project would not involve any distracting visual hazards, including but not limited to, distracting lights, glare, sources of smoke or other obstacles, or an electronic hazard that would interfere with aircraft instruments or radio communications. The project is a residential subdivision that would not involve construction of any structure equal to or greater than 150 feet in height, thereby resulting in the creation of a safety hazard to aircraft and/or operations from an airport or heliport. Further, the project does not include any artificial bird attractor, including but not limited to reservoirs, golf courses with water hazards, large detention and retention basins, wetlands, landscaping with water features, wildlife refuges, or agriculture. Therefore, the project would not constitute a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area.

- 8(e) The proposed project is not within one mile of a private airstrip.
- 8(f)(i) OPERATIONAL AREA EMERGENCY PLAN AND MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL HAZARD MITIGATION PLAN: The project will not interfere with this plan because it will not prohibit subsequent plans from being established or prevent the goals and objectives of existing plans from being carried out.
- 8(f)(ii) SAN DIEGO COUNTY NUCLEAR POWER STATION EMERGENCY RESPONSE PLAN: The property is not within the San Onofre emergency planning zone.
- 8(f)(iii) OIL SPILL CONTINGENCY ELEMENT: The project is not located along the coastal zone.

8(f)(iv) **EMERGENCY WATER CONTINGENCIES ANNEX AND ENERGY SHORTAGE RESPONSE PLAN:** The project would not alter major water or energy supply infrastructure which could interfere with the plan.

8(f)(v) **DAM EVACUATION PLAN:** The project is not located within a dam inundation zone.

8(g) The proposed project is adjacent to wildlands that have the potential to support wildland fires. However, the project will not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires because the project will comply with the regulations relating to emergency access, water supply, and defensible space specified in the Consolidated Fire Code. The project location and design did not require a Fire Protection Plan; however, the Preliminary Grading Plan and Drainage Study were reviewed by the County Fire Marshal and Lakeside Fire Protection District. A Fire Service Availability Letter dated December 18, 2014, has been received from the Lakeside Fire Protection District which indicates the expected emergency travel time to the project site to be 2.6 minutes which is within the 5 minute maximum travel time allowed by the County Public Facilities Element. In addition, a Fire Protection Letter Report dated April 20, 2009 was accepted by County Fire Marshals.

6(h) The project does not involve or support uses that would allow water to stand for a period of 72 hours or more (e.g. artificial lakes, agricultural ponds). Also, the project does not involve or support uses that will produce or collect animal waste, such as equestrian facilities, agricultural operations (chicken coops, dairies etc.), solid waste facility or other similar uses. Moreover, based on a site visit conducted by County staff, there are none of these uses on adjacent properties.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hazards/hazardous materials; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>9. Hydrology and Water Quality – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Violate any waste discharge requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Is the project tributary to an already impaired water body, as listed on the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list? If so, could the project result in an increase in any pollutant for which the water body is already impaired?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Could the proposed project cause or contribute to an exceedance of applicable surface or groundwater receiving water quality objectives or degradation of beneficial uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

e) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

☐ ☐ ☐

f) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

☐ ☐ ☐

g) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?

☐ ☐ ☐

h) Provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

☐ ☐ ☐

i) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, including County Floodplain Maps?

☐ ☐ ☐

j) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?

☐ ☐ ☐

k) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding?

☐ ☐ ☐

l) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

☐ ☐ ☐

m) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐ ☐ ☐

## Discussion

9(a) The project will require a NPDES General Permit for Discharges of Storm Water Associated with Construction Activities. The project applicant has provided a Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) which demonstrates that the project will comply with all requirements of the WPO. The project will be required to implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and/or treatment control BMPs to reduce potential pollutants to the maximum extent practicable. These measures will enable the project to meet waste discharge requirements as required by the San Diego Municipal Permit, as implemented by the San Diego County Jurisdictional Urban Runoff Management Program (JURMP) and Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plan (SUSMP).

- 9(b) The project lies in the 907.12/ Santee hydrologic subareas, within the San Diego hydrologic unit. According to the Clean Water Act Section 303(d) list, a portion of this watershed is impaired for pollutants/ stressors. Constituents of concern in the San Diego River (Lower) watershed include Enterococcus, Fecal Coliform, Low Dissolved Oxygen, Manganese, Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Total Dissolved Solids, Toxicity. The project could contribute to release of these pollutants; however, the project will comply with the WPO and implement site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs to prevent a significant increase of pollutants to receiving waters.
- 9(c) As stated in responses 9(a) and 9(b) above, implementation of BMPs and compliance with required ordinances will ensure that project impacts are less than significant.
- 9(d) The project will obtain its water supply from the Lakeside Water District that obtains water from surface reservoirs or other imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater. In addition, the project does not involve operations that would interfere substantially with groundwater recharge.
- 9(e) As outlined in the project's SWQMP, the project will implement source control and/or treatment control BMP's to reduce potential pollutants, including sediment from erosion or siltation, to the maximum extent practicable from entering storm water runoff.
- 9(f) The project will not significantly alter established drainage patterns or significantly increase the amount of runoff for the following reasons: based on a Drainage Study prepared by Chang Consultants (Wayne W. Chang) on December 14, 2016, drainage will be conveyed to either natural drainage channels or approved drainage facilities.
- 9(g) The project proposed to mitigate any increase in runoff volume by two alternatives. In the first alternative, the applicant will mitigate any increase in runoff by upgrading the downstream privately maintained storm drain system from 24" to 42". In the second alternative, the applicant will mitigate any increase in the runoff volume by constructing an additional on-site detention basin. Both of these alternatives have been thoroughly examined in the drainage study and it has been concluded that no impact is expected after the implementation of these mitigation measures.
- 9(h) The project has the potential to generate pollutants; however, site design measures, source control BMPs, and treatment control BMPs will be employed such that potential pollutants will be reduced to the maximum extent practicable.
- 9(i) No FEMA mapped floodplains, County-mapped floodplains or drainages with a watershed greater than 25 acres were identified on the project site or off-site improvement locations.
- 9(j) No 100-year flood hazard areas were identified on the project site or offsite improvement locations.
- 9(k) The project site lies outside any identified special flood hazard area.
- 9(l) The project site lies outside a mapped dam inundation area for a major dam/reservoir within San Diego County. In addition, the project is not located immediately downstream of a minor dam that could potentially flood the property.
- 9(m)(i) SEICHE: The project site is not located along the shoreline of a lake or reservoir.

9(m)(ii) TSUNAMI: The project site is not located in a tsunami hazard zone.

9(m)(iii) MUDFLOW: Mudflow is type of landslide. See response to question 6(a)(iv).

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to/from hydrology/water quality; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>10. Land Use and Planning</b> – Would the Project:			
a) Physically divide an established community?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

10(a) The project does not propose the introduction of new infrastructure such as major roadways, water supply systems, or utilities to the area.

10(b) The project would not conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, including policies of the General Plan and Community Plan.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to land use/planning; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>11. Mineral Resources</b> – Would the Project:			
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11(a) The project site has been classified by the California Department of Conservation – Division of Mines and Geology as undetermined mineral resources (MRZ-3). However, the project site is surrounded by residential uses which are incompatible to future			

extraction of mineral resources on the project site. A future mining operation at the project site would likely create a significant impact to neighboring properties for issues such as noise, air quality, traffic, and possibly other impacts. Therefore, the project will not result in the loss of a known mineral resource because the resource has already been lost due to incompatible land uses.

- 11(b) The project site is not located in an Extractive Use Zone (S-82), nor does it have an Impact Sensitive Land Use Designation (24) with an Extractive Land Use Overlay (25).

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to mineral resources; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>12. Noise</b> – Would the Project:			
a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 12(a) Noise measures would ensure that the project would not expose people to potentially significant noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of the General Plan, Noise Ordinance, or other applicable standards for the following reasons:

General Plan – Noise Element: The project consists of 5.24 acres to be subdivided into 13 or 14 residential lots. The project is subject to the County Noise Element exterior

noise threshold of 60 dBA CNEL for proposed exterior sensitive outdoor areas. Based on the location of the site and intervening topography and existing structures, the proposed subdivision would not be exposed to future traffic noise exceeding the 60 dBA CNEL sound level requirements pursuant to the County Noise Element. Additionally, exposure to 60 dBA CNEL at habitable structures would typically require an interior noise study to ensure interior Noise Element requirement of 45 dBA is met. This interior noise study requirement is not apply to this project and no noise mitigation is required for Noise Element conformance. Project traffic contributions on nearby roadways were determined to result in less than significant off-site direct and cumulative impacts. Traffic would not result in a substantial contribution to the existing noise levels along these nearby roadways pursuant to the County Noise Guidelines. The project is in conformance with the County Noise Element.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-404:

Non-transportation noise generated by the project is not expected to exceed the standards of the Noise Ordinance at or beyond the project's property line. Therefore, staff anticipates that the project would not exceed the most restrictive 45 dBA nighttime one-hour average sound level limit.

Noise Ordinance – Section 36-408 and-409:

Temporary construction noise was assessed and would be subject to the County 75 dBA eight hour average requirement at the boundary of any occupied property, specifically an existing residence. Earth movement proposed would be a balance cut and fill with no import or export. Impulsive construction activities along with drilling and blasting are no proposed. No materials are to be processed on site. The site will be mass graded and site preparation would take approximately one month. Incorporation of construction equipment measures would help reduce the overall construction equipment noise as temporary construction operations are not anticipated to exceed county noise standards.

- 12(b) The project proposes residences where low ambient vibration is essential for interior operation and/or sleeping conditions. However, the facilities are typically setback more than 50 feet from any County Mobility Element (ME) roadway using rubber-tired vehicles with projected groundborne noise or vibration contours of 38 VdB or less; any property line for parcels zoned industrial or extractive use; or any permitted extractive uses. A setback of 50 feet from the roadway centerline for heavy-duty truck activities would insure that these proposed uses or operations do not have any chance of being impacted significantly by groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels (Harris, Miller Miller and Hanson Inc., Transit Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment 1995, Rudy Hendriks, Transportation Related Earthborne Vibrations 2002). This setback insures that this project site will not be affected by any future projects that may support sources of groundborne vibration or groundborne noise related to the adjacent roadways.

Also, the project does not propose any major, new or expanded infrastructure such as mass transit, highways or major roadways or intensive extractive industry that could generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels and impact vibration sensitive uses in the surrounding area.

Therefore, the project will not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels on a project or cumulative level.

- 12(c) As indicated in the response listed under Section 12(a), the project would not expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas in the vicinity to a substantial permanent increase in noise levels that exceed the allowable limits of any applicable noise standards. Also, the project is not expected to expose existing or planned noise sensitive areas to direct and cumulative noise impacts over existing ambient noise levels.
- 12(d) The project does not involve any operational uses that may create substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. Temporary construction noise was assessed and would be subject to the County 75 dBA eight hour average requirement at the boundary of any occupied property, specifically an existing residence. Earth movement proposed would be a balance cut and fill with no import or export. Impulsive construction activities along with drilling and blasting are not proposed. No materials are to be processed on site. The site will be mass graded and site preparation would take approximately one month. Incorporation of construction equipment measures would help reduce the overall construction equipment noise as temporary construction operations are not anticipated to exceed county noise standards.
- 12(e) Although the project is located within 2 miles of the Gillespie Field airport, the project site is located outside of the 60 dBA overflight noise contours. Airport noise associated with this project is considered less than significant.
- 12(f) The project is not located within a one-mile vicinity of a private airstrip.

### Conclusion

The project could result in potentially significant impacts related to noise; however, further environmental analysis is not required because:

1. No peculiar impacts to the project or its site have been identified.
2. There are no potentially significant off-site and/or cumulative impacts which were not discussed by the GPU EIR.
3. No substantial new information has been identified which results in an impact which is more severe than anticipated by the GPU EIR.
4. Feasible mitigation measures contained within the GPU EIR under Noi-4.1 and 4.2 will be applied to the project as notes on the grading plan. Mitigation measures Noi-5.1 has been applied as it relates to Airport Land Use Compatibility Plans.

Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
----------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------

### 13. Population and Housing – Would the Project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

☐
☐
☐

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐☐☐

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

☐☐☐

### Discussion

13(a) The project will not induce substantial population growth in an area because the project does not propose any physical or regulatory change that would remove a restriction to or encourage population growth in an area.

13(b) The project will not displace existing housing.

13(c) The proposed project will not displace a substantial number of people. The site currently has one single family dwelling on the property. If approved, the project would yield additional lots.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to populations and/or housing; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

Significant  
Project  
Impact

Impact not  
identified by  
GPU EIR

Substantial  
New  
Information

### 14. Public Services – Would the Project:

a) Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance service ratios for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public facilities?

☐☐☐

### Discussion

14(a) Based on the project's service availability forms, the project would not result in the need for significantly altered services or facilities.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to public services; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>15. Recreation</b> – Would the Project:			
a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

15(a) The project would incrementally increase the use of existing parks and other recreational facilities; however, the project will be required to pay fees or dedicate land for local parks pursuant to the Park Land Dedication Ordinance.

15(b) The project does not include trails, but a pathway/sidewalk is proposed along Westhill Road. Impacts from these amenities have been considered as part of the overall environmental analysis contained elsewhere in this document.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to recreation; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>16. Transportation and Traffic</b> – Would the Project:			
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of the effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



- |  |                          |                          |                          |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### Discussion

- 16(a) The project will result in an additional 140 ADT. However, the project will not conflict with any established performance measures because the project trips do not exceed the thresholds established by County guidelines. In addition, the project would not conflict with policies related to non-motorized travel such as mass transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.
- 16(b) The additional 140 ADTs from the project do not exceed the 2400 trips (or 200 peak hour trips) required for study under the region's Congestion Management Program as developed by SANDAG.
- 16(c) The proposed project is located within of an Airport Influence Area and is not located within two miles of a public or public use airport. However, the proposal is for a residential subdivision, which would not result in a change in air traffic patterns because the allowable land uses within airport safety zones are created for the purpose of ensuring ongoing airport safety, including maintenance of air traffic patterns. Furthermore, the project would not exceed the FAR Part 77 criteria related to airspace obstructions. Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact on air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks.
- 16(d) The proposed project will not alter traffic patterns, roadway design, place incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) on existing roadways, or create curves, slopes or walls which would impede adequate sight distance on a road.
- 16(e) The Lakeside Fire Protection District and the San Diego County Fire Authority have reviewed the project and its Fire Protection Plan and have determined that there is adequate emergency fire access.
- 16(f) The project will not result in the construction of any road improvements or new road design features that would interfere with the provision of public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. In addition, the project does not generate sufficient travel demand to increase demand for transit, pedestrian or bicycle facilities.

### Conclusion

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to transportation and traffic; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

	Significant Project Impact	Impact not identified by GPU EIR	Substantial New Information
<b>17. Utilities and Service Systems – Would the Project:</b>			
a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Discussion

- 17(a) The project would discharge domestic waste to a community sewer system that is permitted to operate by the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). A project facility availability form has been received from the San Diego County Sanitation District (Lakeside) that indicates that there is adequate capacity to serve the project.
- 17(b) The project involves new water and wastewater pipeline extensions. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(c) The project involves new storm water drainage facilities. However, these extensions will not result in additional adverse physical effects beyond those already identified in other sections of this environmental analysis.
- 17(d) A Service Availability Letter from the Lakeside Water District has been provided which indicates that there is adequate water to serve the project.

- 17(e) A Service Availability Letter from the San Diego County Sanitation District (Lakeside) has been provided, which indicates that there is adequate wastewater capacity to serve the project.
- 17(f) All solid waste facilities, including landfills require solid waste facility permits to operate. There are five, permitted active landfills in San Diego County with remaining capacity to adequately serve the project.
- 17(g) The project will deposit all solid waste at a permitted solid waste facility.

**Conclusion**

As discussed above, the project would not result in any significant impacts to utilities and service systems; therefore, the project would not result in an impact which was not adequately evaluated by the GPU EIR.

**Attachments:**

Appendix A – References

Appendix B – Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067

## Appendix A

The following is a list of project specific technical studies used to support the analysis of each potential environmental effect:

Chang Consultants, Wayne W. Chang (December 14, 2016). Stormwater/HMP Study  
Chang Consultants, Wayne W. Chang (December 14, 2016). Drainage Study  
David Evans and Associates, Patricia McColl, RCE (April 20, 2009). Fire Protection Plan (Letter Report)

For a complete list of technical studies, references, and significance guidelines used to support the analysis of the General Plan Update Final Certified Program EIR, dated August 3, 2011, please visit the County's website at:

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS\\_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR\\_5.00 -  
\\_References\\_2011.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/PDS/gpupdate/docs/BOS_Aug2011/EIR/FEIR_5.00_-_References_2011.pdf)

## Appendix B

A Summary of Determinations and Mitigation within the Final Environmental Impact Report, County of San Diego General Plan Update, SCH # 2002111067 is available on the Planning and Development Services website at:

[http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU\\_FEIR\\_Summary\\_15183\\_Reference.pdf](http://www.sdcounty.ca.gov/pds/gpupdate/GPU_FEIR_Summary_15183_Reference.pdf)